

**CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION GOALS AND ACCOUNTABILITY COMMITTEE**  
**October 21, 2015**  
**SCHOOL BOARD ADMINISTRATION BUILDING**

**Committee Members in Attendance:**

Mr. Steve Elswick  
Mr. Dan Gecker  
Ms. Carrie Coyner  
Ms. Dianne Smith  
Dr. Edgar Wallin

Mr. Allan Carmody  
Mr. John Hilliard  
Mr. Randy Holmes  
Ms. Barbara Mait  
Mr. Andy Scherzer  
Mr. Chris Sorensen

**Others in Attendance:**

Dr. Marcus Newsome  
Mr. Jay Stegmaier

Mr. Elswick called the meeting to order at 1 p.m.

**A. OPENING REMARKS**

There were no opening remarks.

**B. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

On motion of Ms. Coyner, seconded by Mr. Hilliard, the agenda was approved.

**C. APPROVAL OF COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES/ACTION ITEMS**

Ms. Coyner requested that the Manchester Middle School Revitalization Community Meeting be added to the list of upcoming meetings. The meeting is scheduled for November 16 at 5 p.m.

Dr. Wallin inquired about an earlier start time for the November 17 committee meeting, as it could conflict with the Planning Commission's work session. (It is noted the Planning Commission's work session was scheduled for 3:30 p.m., so there was not a conflict with the original 1 p.m. committee meeting start time.)

On motion of Ms. Coyner, seconded by Ms. Mait, the minutes of the August 19, 2015 regular meeting were unanimously approved, as submitted.

Mr. Elswick reordered the agenda to move the Closed Session to the end and the Process for Committee Meetings and Committee Input first.

**D. BUSINESS ITEMS**

**1. PROCESS FOR COMMITTEE MEETINGS AND COMMITTEE INPUT**

Mr. Elswick stated he and Ms. Coyner met with Mr. Stegmaier and Dr. Newsome earlier this month to discuss the progress of this committee. He provided five themes that evolved from that

meeting: 1) the committee tends to focus on items outside of the four items on the committee's charter; 2) a feeling within the committee that Schools' staff are being put on the spot by asking them defensive questions, almost as if in an attack mode; 3) a feeling by some committee members that the agenda is being scripted to minimize input from the committee; 4) a feeling within the committee that the school division picks and chooses project information that is provided to the committee, and they are not a willing partner in the process; and 5) a feeling that the committee has lost sight, that its role is to make recommendations and is not an oversight committee. He stated they also discussed how to move forward from this point on. He then reviewed the proposed process for committee meetings and asked for comments from committee members.

Mr. Hilliard stated Mr. Elswick has summarized the problems that the committee has had very well, and if we can focus on the proposed process as the committee moves forward, we will do our jobs much better.

Mr. Elswick stated, as co-chair, he accepts some of the responsibility for the committee losing its focus. He further stated he believes we all want to spend the taxpayer dollars the best way possible and deliver the best product for our schools.

Ms. Coyner stated it is important for committee members to have information in advance, as well as to know who to go to for deeper information to prepare for meetings. She further stated the process provides a way to bring forward issues based on the charter through the committee's co-chairs.

Dr. Wallin stated it would be helpful to have a flowchart of the bond referendum projects showing where we are in the process with each one.

Ms. Coyner stated the year-long working calendar will be based on proposed timelines for projects.

Mr. Elswick stated any questions that committee members have regarding projects come through him or Ms. Coyner and they will see that the information is provided to the committee members. He noted that there was also discussion related to long-term relations between the School Board and the County and how to move forward in the future with new members coming in.

Mr. Camody stated a communications plan was put into place when the committee was formed. He inquired whether the committee could get back to that in a more rigorous mode to garner excitement from the community about the process and also let them know where we are in the process. He stated staff has been posting agendas and meeting minutes, but he would like to see it as a portal for residents to obtain information regarding the projects.

Ms. Mait expressed appreciation for the efforts of Mr. Elswick and Ms. Coyner and stated, from a citizen's perspective, she is glad to see that the committee will be moving forward to gel as a team.

## **2. UPDATE ON ENON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

Mr. Sorensen provided an update on the site selection process for Enon Elementary School, which was built in 1928. He discussed a number of variables that have changed since the current school was constructed. He stated an RFP was recently issued for an engineering firm to do a feasibility study regarding the footprint of a two-story school being placed on the current 11.6-acre site, as well as approximately 22 surrounding acres, which encompass three separate areas.

In response to committee members' questions, Mr. Sorensen stated the small parcels looked at as a part of the study all have homes located on them with different property owners.

Mr. Scherzer inquired whether some of the regulations could be modified, such as setback requirements. He noted that, if the building was designed properly, it might take up far less acreage.

Discussion ensued relative to various components of the RFP and the flexibility necessary to use the current site.

Mr. Sorensen provided the previous site selection criteria used for the Beulah Elementary project.

In response to committee members' questions, Mr. Sorensen stated Schools looks for 30 contiguous acres on which to construct a school, although the Comp Plan only requires 20 buildable acres.

Mr. Holmes stated there have been many new regulations since 1928. He further stated today's trend is for neighborhoods where residents can walk, live and raise their families without so much dependence on vehicles. He stated requiring larger sites would make it less and less friendly for walking and biking to school. He inquired whether the things we are doing are moving in the same direction as the current trends and whether that is something that should be considered when making decisions on school placements.

Mr. Sorensen provided a map of the Enon community depicting where the students who currently attend Enon Elementary School reside, as well as many of the students who attend Elizabeth Scott Elementary School.

Ms. Coyner noted that the map shows only one-fourth of the Rivers Bend neighborhood, and ten additional sections of Rivers Bend are not shown.

Discussion ensued relative to the number of students in Rivers Bend and the anticipated increase in students as the remainder of Rivers Bend is developed.

In response to Mr. Holmes' question, Ms. Coyner stated there is land available within a walkable area of Rivers Bend for a potential school.

Mr. Holmes stated, if the committee is to be a recommendation committee, then we should look at those areas, determine where the projected growth is, and see if something could be done in the neighborhood that embeds the school into an area that allows the maximum number of

students to have an easy access to the site. He further stated the current site of Enon Elementary is well positioned to serve that neighborhood well. He inquired about the possibility of renovating that school and building another school at a location in Rivers Bend. He also inquired about the understanding of where the market is going, where people are looking for schools to be built and how they want them to function, and whether that criteria is being considered when evaluating potential sites, in addition to all the other regulations and zoning requirements that the sites have to meet.

Mr. Gecker stated there have been discussions in the county for many years about whether the market responds to school placement. He further stated Cosby High School was placed where it is because the school division forecasted there would be a demand in that area, and then the growth came to that area. He stated the new Matoaca High School was built in the middle of nowhere, then subdivisions were built all around it. He further stated it was the Board of Supervisors' goal to use the revitalization of schools as a way to lift up some of the older communities, and there should be a lot of consideration given toward spending dollars within those communities so that they are not left behind. He stated if the school is moved to a greenfield site with the idea that growth is going to occur around it, this will incentivize the construction of higher quality homes around the new school as opposed to incentivizing reinvestment in existing neighborhoods, which is a clear goal of the Comprehensive Plan adopted by the Board in 2012.

Discussion ensued relative to the older community surrounding Enon Elementary School, the availability of property for new home sites in the area, and the impact of redistricting throughout the county.

Mr. Elswick inquired about a timeline for a decision on the Enon Elementary project, so that the committee will know its timeline for making a recommendation.

Mr. Sorensen stated the timeline would be from now until the summer of 2016, indicating that the school division would like to make a decision sooner rather than later and would like a recommendation from the committee as soon as possible.

Discussion ensued relative to challenges involved with the attendance areas for both Enon Elementary and Elizabeth Scott Elementary, including railroad tracks and a major interstate.

Mr. Gecker inquired whether the existing site can be used.

Ms. Coyner stated, other than the gymnasium, the existing building cannot be re-used.

Mr. John Brooks stated the RFP for the engineer's feasibility study for renovating the school on the existing site should be completed late this week or early next week, and it would be 4-6 weeks before a decision could be made.

Discussion ensued relative to siting the school to promote walkability; properties that could be acquired to increase the acreage of the current site; and constructing a two-story versus one-story school on the existing site.

Ms. Coyner stated it is less expensive to build a new school to add capacity for seats long-term, but if a larger size school would not fit on the current site, then a decision would have to be made

whether to keep the smaller size school on the existing or to construct a larger new school at a different site. She further stated placing a smaller size school on the current site could result in the need for an additional elementary school sooner than if a larger school were to be built with additional capacity, and this could be a topic for a recommendation if the engineer says the larger school will not fit on the current site.

Mr. Hilliard inquired about the location of the tracts that have been looked at for a possible new school site.

Ms. Coyner stated there are several 20- to 30-acre sites in different locations scattered throughout the school zone. She further stated some general information from the consultant should be available in four to six weeks, and Mr. Sorensen will place this topic back on the committee's agenda.

### **3. CLOSED SESSION**

On motion of Ms. Smith, seconded by Mr. Holmes, the committee unanimously voted to go into closed session in accordance with Section 2.2-3711(A) of the Code of Virginia, the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, and specifically under subsection 3, for discussion or consideration of acquisition of real property for a public purpose where discussion in an open meeting would adversely affect the bargaining position or negotiating strategy of the public body.

(It is noted Ms. Coyner excused herself from the meeting at 2:05 p.m., prior to the end of the Closed Session.)

On motion of Mr. Hilliard, seconded by Ms. Mait, the committee reconvened to open session.

On motion of Ms. Smith, seconded by Ms. Mait, the following resolution was adopted by the committee:

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the Capital Construction Goals and Accountability Committee hereby certifies that, to the best of each member's knowledge (i) only public business matters lawfully exempted from opening meeting requirements by Virginia law were discussed in the closed meeting to which this certification resolution applies, and (ii) only such public business matters as were identified in the motion convening the closed meeting were heard, discussed, or considered by the committee.

Mr. Elswick: Yes.  
Mr. Gecker: Yes.  
Ms. Smith: Yes.  
Dr. Wallin: Yes.  
Mr. Hilliard: Yes.  
Mr. Holmes: Yes.  
Ms. Mait: Yes.  
Mr. Scherzer: Yes.  
Mr. Sorensen: Yes.  
Mr. Carmody: Yes.

#### **4. ADJOURNMENT**

On motion of Mr. Holmes, seconded by Mr. Scherzer, the committee adjourned until November 17, 2015, at 1 p.m.